PTO/SB/21 (02-04) Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031 U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Total Number of Pages in This Submission

Application Number	09/445,102		
Filing Date	November 30, 1999		
First Named Inventor	Kenji Uchiyama		
Art Unit	2871		
Examiner Name	Tai V. Duong		
Attorney Docket Number	93195-000112		

ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)							
Fee Transmittal For	m	☑ Drawing(s)			After Allowance Communication to Group		
Fee Attached		Licensing-related Papers			Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences		
Amendment / Reply		Petition			Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)		
After Final		Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application			Proprietary Information		
Affidavits/declar	ration(s)	Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address		dress [Status Letter		
Extension of Time Request		Terminal Disclaimer		Ø	Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):		
Express Abandonment Request		Request for Refund CD, Number of CD(s)			Form PTOL-85 (in duplicate), Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance and acknowledgement postcard.		
Information Disclosure Statement					downowing goment postedia.		
Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)				-			
Response to Missing Incomplete Applicate Response to Misparts under 37 1.52 or 1.53	ion ssing				·		
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT							
Firm or Individual name	Harness, Dickey & Pierce, P.L.C. Attorney Name Reg. (Afgregory Schivley 2 27.38				Reg. No. 27,382		
Signature	J. Mayon Mente						
Date April 2, 2004							
GERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING							
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.							
Typed or printed name G. Gregory Soniyley			1.0	Express Ma Label No.	EV 406 076 683 US (4/23/2004)		
Signature			h/ //	Date	Apri 23, 2004		

This collection of information is required by 37 OFR 1.5/The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentially is governed by 35 U.S. (2122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form of the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Illyou need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.





IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No.:

09/445,102

Filing Date:

11/30/1999

Applicant:

Kenji Uchiyama

Group Art Unit:

2871

Examiner:

Tai V. Duong

Title:

COMPRESSION-BOND CONNECTION SUBSTRATE,

LIQUID CRYSTAL DEVICE, AND ELECTRONIC

EQUIPMENT

Attorney Docket:

9319S-000112

Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Reasons for allowance are only warranted in instances in which "the record of the prosecution as a whole does not make clear [the Examiner's] reasons for allowing a claim or claims." 37 C.F.R. 1.104 (e). In the present case, Applicant believes the record as a whole makes clear the reasons for allowance and therefore no statement by the Examiner is necessary or warranted, especially since the statement may unfairly focus on certain reasons for allowance which are not reflected by the prosecution history. Therefore, the record should reflect that Applicant does not necessarily agree with each statement in the reasons for allowance. For example, while Applicant believes the claims are allowable, Applicant may not unequivocally agree that

patentability resides solely in the specific feature or combination of features identified, or that each feature or combination of features identified is required for patentability, or that equivalents of any of the recited features are outside the scope of the claims. Moreover, to the extent the reasons for allowance do not separately address the subject matter of all the claims, Applicant does not acquiesce to any inference that the non-addressed claims fail to present other reasons for patentability apart from the patentability of the claims which were specifically addressed by the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated

By:

G./Gregory, Schivley

Reg. No. 27,382

Reg. No. 49:344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C. P.O. Box 828 Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303 (248) 641-1600

Amil 23, 2004